

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-74) on the resolution (H. Res. 107) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 104th Congress, which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 999, WELFARE REFORM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities may have until 5 p.m. today to file a late report on H.R. 999, the Welfare Reform Consolidation Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that last evening I was not recorded on rollcall vote No. 226. I voted in the affirmative. I was on the House floor. I put my card in the machine; I saw the light go on. I did not remember to check whether it had recorded on the board, and I regret the fact that it did not record, but I am absolutely certain I voted.

I have been a long-time advocate of malpractice reform. I support the cap, and I regret that my vote was not recorded in rollcall 226 but I would have voted "aye."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 13, the House will meet in proforma session at 2 p.m. There will be no votes on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. There will be no votes until 5 p.m. We expect to consider eight bills under suspension of the rules. If any votes are called on these bills, they will be held over until 5 p.m.

The following bills are scheduled for consideration under suspension of the rules on Monday:

H.R. 402, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Amendments Act;

H.R. 421, the Cook Inlet Region Purchase of Common Stock Act;

H.R. 715, the Sea of Okhotsk Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1995;

H.R. 531, the Great Western Scenic Trail Designation Act;

H.R. 694, the Minor Boundary Adjustments and Miscellaneous Park Amendments Act;

H.R. 562, the Walnut Canyon National Monument Modification Act of 1995;

H.R. 536, the Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area Vehicle Operation Fees Act; and

H.R. 517, the Chacoan Outliers Protection Act of 1995.

□ 1245

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 11 a.m. to take up House Resolution 107, the committee funding resolution. We expect to complete the resolution and then move to consideration of H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, the fiscal year 1995 emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions legislation, subject to a rule.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to complete the supplemental and rescission package. It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their districts and their families by 3 p.m. on Thursday.

I would remind Members that the House will not be in session next Friday or on the following Monday due to the district work period.

On the following Tuesday, March 21, we do not expect votes to be held before 5 p.m. If there is any change in this schedule we will notify Members as soon as possible to allow you to finalize your travel plans at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BONIOR. I would ask my friend from Texas, do you expect to have votes on any of these suspension bills that the gentleman listed on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, of course votes are possible on any of them. We cannot predict at this time whether or not there will be votes, so Members should be advised that we expect votes after 5 o'clock on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. The reason I ask is these are the same bills that we had in the last Congress. They were so far as I know completely noncontroversial and passed without any objections to them last Congress. And they are the only business we are going to have on Tuesday. On votes, I think we might want to consider whether we want to go ahead with the votes on Tuesday on these measures which appear to be very noncontroversial, but I just raise that as something for my friend to consider.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Briefly on that, I remember back when we had things like this come up, a lot of things, we would roll the votes to the next day when we had a pretty good idea we were not going to have votes or very many votes, and if we are just going to come back here on Tuesday and there are really not going to be any votes after all, I just do not understand it. And the other thing, it does not appear on Wednesday that we are going to be having a real heavy schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. Well, it is my understanding what the majority would like to do is deal with the committee funding bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is probably an hour.

Mr. BONIOR. And it is possible to roll the votes, and I would hope my friends on the other side of the aisle would consider that.

May I also ask the majority leader what time for the last votes on Tuesday and Wednesday? Any sense of that?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, obviously this is a very important piece of legislation. We want to make sure that we can set our timing to as much as possible assure Members of their 3 o'clock departure on Thursday. We should be prepared to go late on both Tuesday and Wednesday night, and of course we would go no later than what we think is necessary to guarantee that 3 o'clock departure.

Mr. BONIOR. If we are only going to do the suspensions on Tuesday, what would necessitate us to go late Tuesday evening?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman's point is well taken. Tuesday night may not necessarily be such a late night, but Wednesday night we should be prepared.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his information on that.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. I was wondering about our procedure this next week. Under the new open rules under the Contract With America, when we took up the law enforcement block grants there were at least 10 Members who were denied the right to offer an amendment. On national security there were at least eight Members who were denied an opportunity to offer an amendment. On the regulatory moratorium there were at least 15 Members who were denied the opportunity to offer an amendment. On risk assessment there were a mere three Members including myself and a Republican colleague who were denied the opportunity to offer an amendment. On the takings legislation, two Members, at least two Members were denied the opportunity to offer an amendment.

This week the numbers went up dramatically, four on attorney accountability, three on securities litigation. But 60 specific amendments, germane

amendments, were not declared in order to be offered, Members cut off from the opportunity to offer them even though we have all afternoon, and now apparently under the answers from the majority leader all of Monday and Tuesday that could have been allocated, and I am just wondering with reference to the matters that are scheduled for next week, will we have more Members cut off and denied the opportunity to offer an amendment, or do you think it will stay at the current high level?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. On the recession bill that we will have under consideration next week we are asking Members to preprint the amendment requests. We anticipate that no requests that are made will be rejected.

Mr. BONIOR. If I could just engage my colleague from Texas and my friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, the gentleman from New York announced that the Republican leadership is considering a restrictive rule for the rescission bill, a rule which contains a new set of limitations on the amendment process. It seems to us that under these new standards virtually all of the amendments that were offered in the Committee on Appropriations markup would be blocked on the House floor.

Is that pretty much the gentleman's understanding of the rule which is going to be given to us this week?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. The only restrictions on the proposed rule, and we have not made the determination yet, is that on any reinstatement of cuts that appear in the rescission bill, that that would require an offsetting cut. However, if Members were to cut further on those issues that are in the 10 chapters of the bill, they are free to do so. So any of those amendments that were offered in committee can be offered all over again, and hopefully they will be.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue that for just a minute with the gentleman from New York, because I had drafted an amendment in regard to restoring the funds for the veterans' outpatient clinic, one in my district that was eliminated in this rescission bill, and I would like to get that money back in.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would like to help the gentleman.

Mr. VOLKMER. You could help, if you really want to.

Mr. SOLOMON. I intend to do so.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am willing to offset, you understand. We found the money to offset. The Parliamentarian tells me it does not fit because we are taking money, we are cutting money elsewhere than what is cut in the bill.

If I do not cut, deeper that is than cuts that are in the bill, I cannot cut anywhere else even in the same agency. That is what the gentleman is doing. He is telling me if I want to put the money back for VA I have to take it either out of housing money or someplace else. I cannot cut any further because the committee has already cut the full limits that can be cut in those items. But I cannot go to someplace else and cut and make a cut. The gentleman will not let me do that.

Mr. SOLOMON. It has to be cut by chapter.

Mr. VOLKMER. No, not just chapter, I have to cut within the areas within which the committee already cut. Does the gentleman understand what I am saying?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is correct. Those issues that are in that chapter of the bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right. And I cannot cut outside of those if I find money.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. I cannot cut money someplace else in that chapter, in that agency. I cannot make that cut unless there is already a cut within that in the bill in that specific amount or area.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. What I am trying to tell my majority whip is they are limiting the amendments by structuring it so we cannot offer amendments unless we make deeper cuts in the programs that we believe in.

Mr. BONIOR. I am aware of that, and that is why I raised the issue with the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. These standards seem arbitrary, and I would hope the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would reconsider their position before we go to a rule next week.

I yield to my friend the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Like the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, I am interested in getting something done about the deficit, and so the one amendment that I am most interested in that the gentleman made general reference to was that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], to see that all of the rescissions go to reducing the deficit. Will that amendment be in order here on the floor?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, I do not believe so. I think you are going to be legislating in an appropriation bill to do that, and under the rules of the House you are not allowed to. That is why the gentleman from Missouri cannot offer his amendment, because it would be in violation of the rule of the House. We are trying to abide by the rules.

Mr. DOGGETT. Does not the bill as reported legislate on the same matter?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I will in just a second. But I think the gentleman from Texas

is absolutely correct. There are things in the bill that legislate on appropriations, and I think my friends recognize that. So if that is the case, it seems to us the point my friend from Texas is making is a valid one, an even more important one given the deficit problem we face and its relationship to the other authorizations.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentleman will yield further, only momentarily to say, if I understand the answer, we will be denied any further opportunity to see that the cuts that are being made go to reduce the size of the Federal deficit to ensure they all go there, and that is something that is very important to those of us who believe in pay-as-you-go Government. And I am assuming we will be cut off entirely from the opportunity to see that that happens next week.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York as to whether or not this rule that will be forthcoming on the rescission bill will protect the language in the bill that does legislate on an appropriation bill, or is that going to be left alone so that it will be subject to a point of order?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, the Rules Committee has not met. We are going to take that into consideration.

I can just say to the gentleman though who wants to offer the additional amendment which would legislate in an appropriation bill, even if the appropriation bill did not follow the rules of the House, we intend to.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well then, what the gentleman is telling me basically is I had hoped that what is good for the goose is going to be good for the gander, and if you are not going to permit further things like I would like to do or the gentleman from Pennsylvania would like to do, the Murtha amendment, et cetera that you are going to also protect other things that are in the bill that were put in committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to the gentleman, come to the Rules Committee meeting at 10:30 on Tuesday morning and we will be glad to entertain the gentleman's testimony.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan yielding.

Since, in fact, the Rules Committee does invite the Members to come and give testimony and make requests before the committee before writing the rule, and since, in fact, we can debate the merits of the rule during the debate that there will be time scheduled for, I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan had any more questions about the schedule for next week?

Mr. BONIOR. I have one other question for my distinguished majority

leader, and that resolves around the rescission bill itself. The gentleman mentioned that two bills will be considered in the Rules Committee and brought to the floor. Does the gentleman expect these rules to be considered separately?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, as I pointed out, the Rules Committee has not yet met and decided that.

Mr. BONIOR. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee whether his intention is to consider these bills separately or together?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, as the distinguished majority leader has said, the Rules Committee has not met, but I will say to the gentleman that there is a probability that we will.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me just mention to my friends, one bill is an emergency bill and one is a nonemergency bill, and as the gentleman will recall vividly from his objections last year, the rules were changed to make it contrary to the new House rules to have these bills considered together and combined. So I hope we will stay with the rules and standards which you established for us during the last Congress and have implemented in the rules of this Congress.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield finally to any friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Majority Leader, if I could engage you for a moment, I want to point out to the majority leader that last week you and I had a colloquy. The gentleman observed that it was in our best interest to put me at home with my family as opposed to having me on the floor, and you know we agree on that, and I want to thank the gentleman.

I was speaking with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] as we went off the floor and I said see, just 1 week later and we have 3 days that we will be able to be with our families, so we thank the gentleman for that.

I would note, with my tongue just a little bit in my cheek, that this may bring out something that we have been trying to say all along, that when you remove items of the contract from consideration, like the term limits bill, that not bringing something up under the contract might truly be construed as family friendly.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to take up one other little matter with the floor leader, and just bring it to his attention, and I hope that in the future maybe we can work out a little bit better utilization of time than we have been.

This morning we had a limit of 10 1-minutes on each side. At the time we had a number, quite a few more here that wanted to make 1-minutes, including yours truly, and I do not know,

there were other Members of your party here also, but I do not know how many wanted to do 1-minutes. I did not go ask them.

□ 1300

But we are here now at 1 o'clock and everything, and I would hope that in the future Members would be able to give them. I appreciate it if the majority leader would recognize that this is an opportunity that many Members think is very worthwhile, to express themselves on an issue, and that by reducing that time unnecessarily it appears to some of us that you just do not want to hear us on the floor of the House, and I hope that that is not so. I would hope that, come like Monday, and Tuesday, there should not be any limit at all; come Wednesday, that we could have sufficient—at least 15 on each side, and then Thursday we will leave it up to you because you want to get out, and we all want to get out at 3 o'clock. But I would hope that we can have a little more favorable view of these 1-minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] that I would look forward to listening to him speak for as long as he wants. I am sure he could have a 1-hour prime time special order on Monday, and, if the gentleman takes that special order, I am sure I will find some time to listen to some part of it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I am not looking for the 1 hour for myself. I am looking for other Members that have been over here that have speeches ready to go and cannot give them because we have an artificial barrier of limiting the 1-minutes when some feel that it really is not necessary to limit it on certain days, and I would hope that the floor leader—I am not asking for an answer right now, but I hope he looks at it for the future and tries to assess it a little bit different.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we plan for a 3 o'clock departure for today. We had a couple of amendments withdrawn. We had a couple of others that were accepted, and we got a bonus because of the working relationship of the majority and minority Members on the floor, and, yes, it turns out, given that circumstance, that our need was not as we had thought it was, and I thank the gentleman for his point.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority leader a very pleasant and happy weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). The Chair would point out that additional 1-minute speeches are in order at this time.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY,
MARCH 14, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 13, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m., on Tuesday, March 14, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
MARCH 10, 1995, TO MONDAY,
MARCH 13, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE TRANSFER
OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEE POSI-
TIONS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for the transfer of certain employee positions and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That (a)(1) the two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the majority leader.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1988, as contained in section 101(i) of Public Law 100-202; and

(B) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990.

(b)(1) The two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the majority leader to the House Republican Conference.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and